

Message

From: LEE, LILY [LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]
Sent: 8/13/2018 5:28:26 AM
To: Chesnutt, John [Chesnutt.John@epa.gov]
Subject: FW: Rad RG's RE: Need for new risk assessment in 5 Year Review + for Parcel G retesting Workplan

Sounds good, thanks. It would be good to have it out before we see everybody in the morning

Sent from my iPhone

> On Aug 12, 2018, at 10:26 PM, Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov> wrote:
>
> This looks very good to me. So you want me to send to Derek now? And copy Thomas and who else?
>
> From: LEE, LILY
> Sent: Sunday, August 12, 2018 9:48 PM
> To: Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>
> Subject: FW: Please email Derek FW: Rad RG's RE: Need for new risk assessment in 5 Year Review + for Parcel G retesting Workplan
>
>
>
> From: LEE, LILY
> Sent: Saturday, August 11, 2018 8:51 PM
> To: Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.govmailto:Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>
> Subject: Please email Derek FW: Rad RG's RE: Need for new risk assessment in 5 Year Review + for Parcel G retesting Workplan
>
> Dear John, below is language mostly from Brianna:
> Derek,
> No, we are not asking you to propose any changes to the ROD RGs at this time. We are asking you to evaluate whether the RGs that were selected are still protective. The primary goal of a five year review is to evaluate whether the current selected remedy is still protective and to propose any changes necessary to ensure continued protectiveness. EPA headquarters has stated in writing for years (see below), and reconfirmed last week, that we should use the most current version of the PRG and BPRG calculators in evaluating protectiveness of a radiological clean-up goal, regardless of how the clean-up goal was originally derived.
>
> The NRC standard was identified as an ARAR, but was not used to derive clean-up values, as it is outside the risk range. It is not consistent with CERCLA or EPA guidance to use 25 millirem/year to set clean-up values. There is no applicable state ARAR for radiation in California for decommissioning. So clean-up values at Hunters Point were and are set using the CERCLA risk range and a risk evaluation. Our request is that the Navy evaluate the existing RGs using the most current PRG and BPRG calculators to see whether they still fall within the risk range. If they are not protective, the Navy can propose a change to the RODs to be implemented through a separate process.
>
>
> * John
>
> From: "Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO"
<derek.j.robinson1@navy.milmailto:derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>
> Date: August 2, 2018 at 6:30:22 AM PDT
> To: "LEE, LILY" <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOVmailto:LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>, "Janda, Danielle L CIV"
<danielle.janda@navy.milmailto:danielle.janda@navy.mil>, "Banister, Stephen D CIV NAVFAC SW"
<stephen.banister@navy.milmailto:stephen.banister@navy.mil>
> Cc: "Chesnutt, John" <Chesnutt.John@epa.govmailto:Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>, "Edwards, Zachary L CIV SEA 04 04N" <zachary.edwards@navy.milmailto:zachary.edwards@navy.mil>, "Slack, Matthew L CIV SEA 04 04N" <matthew.slack@navy.milmailto:matthew.slack@navy.mil>
> Subject: RE: Rad RG's RE: Need for new risk assessment in 5 Year Review + for Parcel G retesting Workplan
> Hi Lily,
>
> Before talking too much with the team, I want to make sure that I understand your request.
>
> You are requesting that we redo our remedial goals in the 5-year review. Correct? These new RGs would also be used in our retesting of Tetra Tech work. Correct?
>
> For 5-year reviews, the Navy looks at how the numbers were evaluated and if new guidance/information changes our past evaluation. To my knowledge, the current RGs didn't use the EPA's PRG calculator. Is the PRG calculator a requirement? If so, please send guidance that indicates that it is.
>

> In all of our RODs, the ARAR that was accepted for is the NRC 25 millirem/year number. Is there another ARAR that we need to meet? If so, please send the ARAR.

>

> I was under the impression that EPA didn't want the Navy to change our release criteria for the retesting work. Please also confirm that this is what you are asking for.

>

> I look forward to discussing this information and resolving our path forward asap.

>

> Best Regards,

>

> Derek J. Robinson, PE
> BRAC Environmental Coordinator
> Navy BRAC PMO West
> 33000 Nixie Way; Bldg 50
> San Diego CA 92147
> Desk Phone: 619-524-6026

>

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV<mailto:LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>>

> Sent: Monday, July 30, 2018 3:26 PM

> To: Janda, Danielle L CIV <danielle.janda@navy.mil<mailto:danielle.janda@navy.mil>>; Banister, Stephen D CIV NAVFAC SW <stephen.banister@navy.mil<mailto:stephen.banister@navy.mil>>

> Cc: Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov<mailto:Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>>; Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil<mailto:derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>>; Edwards, Zachary L CIV SEA 04 04N <zachary.edwards@navy.mil<mailto:zachary.edwards@navy.mil>>; Slack, Matthew L CIV SEA 04 04N <matthew.slack@navy.mil<mailto:matthew.slack@navy.mil>>

> Subject: [Non-DoD Source] RE: Rad RG's RE: Need for new risk assessment in 5 Year Review + for Parcel G retesting Workplan

>

> Dear Danielle,

>

> We will be submitting a comment noting that the PRG calculators have changed and that the ROC RGs should be reevaluated during the five year review. The current draft does not include any information on RGs for ROCs, so it is unclear what, if any, information the Navy evaluated to determine whether toxicity information had changed. We believe that evaluating protectiveness is broader than identifying new ARARs. As the RGs for ROCs were not based on ARARs, but instead on a risk evaluation, they should be re-evaluated whenever new science or information that might affect the original risk assessment comes to the agency's attention. This new information includes changes to EPA's PRG calculators, especially where the new models result in a more conservative estimate of risk. Here is a link to lists by date of the changes in these calculators over the past 5 years: <https://epa-prgs.ornl.gov/radionuclides/whatsnew.html>.

>

> Given that the Parcel G rad workplan needs current risk numbers for implementation, it would be prudent for the Navy to do this analysis sooner to avoid delay in retesting.

>

> Lily

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Janda, Danielle L CIV [mailto:danielle.janda@navy.mil]

> Sent: Monday, July 30, 2018 9:42 AM

> To: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV<mailto:LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>>; Banister, Stephen D CIV NAVFAC SW <stephen.banister@navy.mil<mailto:stephen.banister@navy.mil>>

> Cc: Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov<mailto:Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>>; Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil<mailto:derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>>; Edwards, Zachary L CIV SEA 04 04N <zachary.edwards@navy.mil<mailto:zachary.edwards@navy.mil>>; Slack, Matthew L CIV SEA 04 04N <matthew.slack@navy.mil<mailto:matthew.slack@navy.mil>>

> Subject: RE: Rad RG's RE: Need for new risk assessment in 5 Year Review + for Parcel G retesting Workplan

>

> Hi Lily,

>

> As with all five year reviews, we reviewed any changes in toxicity or ARARs in order to determine if the current RGs are still protective. If you do not agree with our conclusion, you are welcome to comment on the Five Year Review and we can respond to your comment.

>

> V/r,

> Danielle Janda

> (619)524-6041

>

> From: Banister, Stephen D CIV NAVFAC SW [mailto:stephen.banister@navy.mil]

> Sent: Monday, July 30, 2018 7:38 AM

> To: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV<mailto:LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>>

> Cc: Janda, Danielle L CIV <danielle.janda@navy.mil<mailto:danielle.janda@navy.mil>>; Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov<mailto:Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>>; Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil<mailto:derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>>; Edwards, Zachary L CIV SEA 04 04N

<zachary.edwards@navy.mil<mailto:zachary.edwards@navy.mil>>; Slack, Matthew L CIV SEA 04 04N
<matthew.slack@navy.mil<mailto:matthew.slack@navy.mil>>
> Subject: RE: Rad RG's RE: Need for new risk assessment in 5 Year Review + for Parcel G retesting
Workplan
>
> Hi Lily,
>
> Yes, I remember discussing the PRG calculator over the phone in March and the protectiveness concerns
brought up by the current calculator. We're going to discuss this internally and get back to you later in
the week. Thanks for the email, this will help us to understand the concerns.
>
>
> V/r,
> Stephen Banister
> 619-524-6040
>
>
>
>
> From: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV<mailto:LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>>
> Sent: Sunday, July 29, 2018 9:06 PM
> To: Banister, Stephen D CIV NAVFAC SW <stephen.banister@navy.mil<mailto:stephen.banister@navy.mil>>
> Cc: Janda, Danielle L CIV <danielle.janda@navy.mil<mailto:danielle.janda@navy.mil>>; Chesnutt, John
<Chesnutt.John@epa.gov<mailto:Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>>; Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO
<derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil<mailto:derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>>; Edwards, Zachary L CIV SEA 04 04N
<zachary.edwards@navy.mil<mailto:zachary.edwards@navy.mil>>; Slack, Matthew L CIV SEA 04 04N
<matthew.slack@navy.mil<mailto:matthew.slack@navy.mil>>
> Subject: [Non-DoD Source] FW: Rad RG's RE: Need for new risk assessment in 5 Year Review + for Parcel G
retesting Workplan
>
> Dear Stephen,
>
> I had talked with you earlier in this process and sent you the email below to explain that EPA's
expectation nationwide for many years has been that the Five Year Review process will use the current
version of the USEPA PRG Calculator and Building PRG Calculator to evaluate the protectiveness of the
current ROD RG's for radionuclides. Before you were assigned to be the RPM leading this process, I had
since 2016 discussed this expectation with many of your Navy colleagues. You and they had always
verbally agreed that this would occur. In the July 9, 2018, draft Five-Year Review, in Section 6.2.2.
Changes in Toxicity and Other Contaminant Characteristics, pp. 6-9, the draft does not address
radionuclides at all.
>
> This analysis is especially crucial given that the Navy is about to embark on retesting at Parcel G
through a highly scrutinized process with high stakes outcome. This information is crucial for informing
the workplan.
>
> Please confirm that the Navy will perform this analysis in a timely manner.
>
> Lily
>
> From: LEE, LILY
> Sent: Wednesday, March 14, 2018 9:43 AM
> To: Banister, Stephen D CIV NAVFAC SW <stephen.banister@navy.mil<mailto:stephen.banister@navy.mil>>
> Cc: John Sourial <john.sourial@errg.com<mailto:john.sourial@errg.com>>
> Subject: Rad RG's RE: Need for new risk assessment in 5 Year Review
>
> Dear Stephen and John,
>
> I wanted to pass this latest to you re rad RG's from HQ. I had hoped to have more by now, but I didn't
want to delay getting it to you in case it helps your process.
>
> I know that you have the official documents. I've just been double checking interpretation w/HQ to make
sure that I have the latest versions straight. Judy told me that over her many years of past experience,
sometimes interpretations get updated, and she recommended it's better to discover earlier than later in
the process before you have gotten too far.
>
> The Parcel F Rad Addendum Jan 2017 had in Appendix 2 the EPA PRG Calculator runs. Those results showed
no difference in Navy action required vs. results from RESRAD.
> From: Walker, Stuart
> Sent: Friday, March 9, 2018 9:53 AM
> To: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV<mailto:LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>>
> Cc: Edwards, Jennifer <Edwards.Jennifer@epa.gov<mailto:Edwards.Jennifer@epa.gov>>; Sands, Charles
<Sands.Charles@epa.gov<mailto:Sands.Charles@epa.gov>>; McEaddy, Monica
<McEaddy.Monica@epa.gov<mailto:McEaddy.Monica@epa.gov>>
> Subject: RE: Any changes since 4/2015? RE: Need for new risk assessment in 5 Year Review
>
> Hi Lily,
>

> Good question. I'm not sure, but Jen is the team lead for 5 year reviews, Chuck works a lot with Jen and does deletions, and Monica is their colleague on 5 year reviews for federal facilities. I think they can better answer your question.

>

> Stuart Walker
> Superfund Remedial program National Radiation Expert
> Science Policy Branch
> Assessment and Remediation Division
> Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation
> W (703) 603-8748
> C (202) 262-9986

>

> From: LEE, LILY
> Sent: Friday, March 09, 2018 12:49 PM
> To: Walker, Stuart <Walker.Stuart@epa.gov>
> Subject: Any changes since 4/2015? RE: Need for new risk assessment in 5 Year Review

>

> Dear Stuart,

>

> Thank you for sending this several years ago. Hunters Pt is working on its Five Year Review. Has anything changed since you sent this? (Besides the link being out of date now that EPA has been changing its website in lots of places). I want to make sure we are following the latest requirements. Thanks!

>

> * Lily

>

> From: Walker, Stuart
> Sent: Monday, April 20, 2015 6:27 PM
> Subject: RE: Need for new risk assessment in 5 Year Review

>

> I had a few of you call or email. To clarify, when meant risk assessment, I should have clarified that if you are doing an a modeling run to see if old risk based concentrations are still protective, you should be using EPA's currently recommended model, which are the PRG calculators. I did not mean you had to do a full blown risk assessment document.

>

> The end of my original message referenced Appendix G, in particular the flowchart Exhibit G-4, "Evaluating Changes in Toxicity and Other Contaminant Characteristics," which shows the process you should use to evaluate the significance of changes in toxicity values and other contaminant characteristics when conducting a five-year review. Also that Appendix G, Exhibit G-5, "Hypothetical Scenario for a Change in Toxicity," and Exhibit G-6, "Decision Process for a Hypothetical Change in Toxicity," provide an example of the evaluation process when there are changes in toxicity and other characteristics.

>

> Appendix G can be found at this URL
> http://www.epa.gov/superfund/accomp/5year/appendices_f-g.pdf

>

> Below is a copy Exhibit G-4 and G-6 with some language yellow highlighted.

> [cid:image010.png@01D4328B.639F8A70]

>

> [cid:image011.png@01D4328B.639F8A70]

>

>

>

> From: Walker, Stuart
> Sent: Monday, April 20, 2015 4:32 PM
> To: OSWER OSRTI Radiation Site Decision-Makers; OSWER OSRTI Regional Radiation Contacts; Brown, Ernie; Garvey, Melanie; Fitz-James, Schatzi; Schumann, Jean; Schlieger, Brian; McEaddy, Monica; Cheatham, Reggie; Bertrand, Charlotte; Indermark, Michele; Simes, Benjamin
> Cc: Scozzafava, MichaelE; Anderson, RobinM
> Subject: Need for new risk assessment in 5 Year Review

>

> I have received some questions about whether an updated risk assessment should be developed for a 5 year review, since the PRG calculator has been updated. With the updates in 2014 to the PRG calculator, yes, following our guidance you should do a new risk assessment for a CERCLA Five Year Review.

>

> See Section 4, Question B, pages 4-1 to 4.9 of the 5 Year Review guidance.
> <http://www.epa.gov/superfund/accomp/5year/guidance.pdf>

>

> Below are some excerpted language from those pages of the 5 Year Review guidance.

>

> [cid:image012.png@01D4328B.639F8A70]
> [cid:image013.png@01D4328B.639F8A70]

>

> [cid:image014.png@01D4328B.639F8A70]

>

> [cid:image015.png@01D4328B.639F8A70]

>

> [cid:image016.png@01D4328B.639F8A70]
>
> [cid:image017.png@01D4328B.639F8A70]
> [cid:image018.png@01D4328B.639F8A70]
>
> <image010.png>
> <image011.png>
> <image012.png>
> <image013.png>
> <image014.png>
> <image015.png>
> <image016.png>
> <image017.png>
> <image018.png>